THE EDITOR'S DEPARTMENT

Annual Report

One of the annual tasks expected of me as editor is the preparation of a report to the Executive Committee of the Linguistic Society of America, submitted at the annual meeting in January. I have actually enjoyed fulfilling this duty over the past six years, as it provides me with the opportunity to take stock of what the past year at *Language* has brought in the way of activities and matters pertaining to the journal's operations and policies, and it allows me to note any new developments of relevance involving the journal and to address any topics that I or the Executive Committee see as important. Following my now-established custom, this Annual Report, my sixth 'State-of-the-Journal' address, as it were, appears here in place of my more usual editorial comments in this section of the journal. The version printed here is essentially what was submitted to the Executive Committee in January, though with footnoted updates, embellishments, elaborations, and corrections as appropriate, as well as some minor editorial and typographical adjustments.

Brian D. Joseph
Columbus, Ohio
March 17, 2008

THE EDITOR'S REPORT

Preamble

As I am composing this report, I am within hailing distance of the end of my term as editor of *Language*, with less than thirteen months to go (but who's counting?) and the search for a successor under way and presumably drawing to a close. The December 2007 issue has been put to bed and is in the hands of the printers, so that the number of issues that remain under my purview is down to just four, a single year's worth. While this might be considered a time for nostalgia and reflection, I plan to refrain from that here and rather will include any such musings in my remaining Editor's Department and in my final report. For me this past year has been an interesting one (there is never a dull moment in the *Language* office!), and the editorial demands on me remain as stimulating and challenging as they ever have been. Fortunately, in just about every aspect of operations for the journal, all continues to go smoothly. In what follows, I chronicle the highlights of the past year and point to what is coming up in my final year of service, with a few items for action by the Executive Committee.

Language by the numbers

I start, though, with a numerical overview of volume 83, including any relevant commentary needed to elucidate the statistics. Volume 83 contained the usual four issues, and, continuing a streak started in my second year with the September 2003 issue (79.3), all four issues appeared on time, being mailed out to LSA members by around the third week of the month in which they were due to appear (March, June, September, and December). While a lapse on the part of the compositors kept the September issue (83.3) from being posted electronically on Project Muse on time, that oversight has been rectified and it seems to have been a one-time problem. We continue to lay the groundwork for future issues, with the March 2008 issue (84.1) already in the works, and the papers for the June 2008 issue (84.2) being lined up as well. Thus,

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Language's overall record of on-time delivery of the goods continues and is certain to continue throughout the coming year.

The four issues of volume 83 contained 951 numbered pages. Of that number, 599 pages were devoted to 18 articles, 26 to 2 short reports, 21 to 1 review article, 28 to 3 obituaries, 111 to 35 reviews, 98 to 140 book notices, and 68 to other sorts of material (letters: 5 pages for 4 letters; Editor's Department columns: 18 pages for 4 pieces, including the annual Editor's Report; Recent Publications lists: 18 pages for 4 lists; index: 22 pages; job ads erroneously numbered in one issue: 2 pages; dedications: 2 pages; correction: 1 page).

All of these numbers are roughly comparable to those from the previous year. The total of 951 pages is down a bit from last year's 991 but more than the original target of 900 pages that I started with in 2002. It in part reflects the increase in pages that the Executive Committee approved in 2006 but is also the result of simply printing in each issue what has been available from the accepted papers and reviews and such; the added page allocation allows for some degree of flexibility in what to run in a given issue. I note that there were no discussion notes this year and that the total number of letters and of pages for letters was down considerably. It is surely too soon to declare any trends (and the data is rather limited too), and my belief is that these developments probably reflect the somewhat irregular nature of what might move a reader to write a commentary or response piece, whether in letter or discussion note form. It is likely, based on discussions I have had with prospective contributors, that there will be some discussion notes in the June 2008 issue and two letters are likely for the March 2008 issue.[1] It is encouraging too to see a mini-renascence of the 'short reports'; it is hoped that this genre of contribution will get further play in the coming years (and I encourage authors to think in those terms if a submission seems able to be tailored to fit under that rubric).[2]

The articles in volume 83 show an average length of 33.28 pages, up from last year's average (30.67) but down from the high of two years ago (35.6) and closer to that of three years ago (32.44). Many (myself included) have bemoaned the creeping length of articles, but I am not sure this is necessarily a bad thing or just an inevitability (given more literature to cite, greater use of tables and figures, etc.). The inclusion of two short reports in this volume means that with them counted as well, the average length of original contributions falls to 31.25 (versus 29.89 last year, employing a similar standard of measure, with the one short report of 2006 counted in). No matter how the numbers are tweaked, the basic issue is that most submissions received by *Language* these days range from 40 to 60 pages in manuscript form, and some are still considerably longer. I thus see it more as a matter of the way the field is going and not something that tighter editorial control can do much about (though I am willing of course to listen to constructive ideas about this matter).

Therefore, for volume 83, the ratio of 'substantive' pieces (articles, review articles, short reports, and obituaries) to review pieces (book reviews and book notices) was 3.22 : 1 this year (674 pages : 209 pages), as compared with 2.94 : 1 in 2006 (and 3.74 : 1 in 2005). This figure means that 23.7% of the pages in 2007 were book reviews or notices, somewhat lower than the 2006 distribution of 25.4% (and higher than that of 2005, 21.1%). These figures will necessarily change drastically next year due to the

[1] As it happened, there was only one letter in the March issue, but this present issue has two, as well as three discussion notes.

[2] Indeed, there have been three submissions under this rubric just since January.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

relocation of book notices to *eLanguage*, and it will thus be up to the next editor to seek the proper balance of review-to-nonreview material.

It is customary to augment this listing of purely numerical facts about *Language* with a more qualitative, but still somewhat quantitative, view of the numbers and types of both papers submitted and papers acted on in the past twelve months. As has been the case since November 2002, the twelve-month reporting period runs from November 1 of the previous year, in this case 2006, to October 31 of the current year (2007), since these dates allow for my staff to develop a full count that can be reported in time for the annual meeting of the Executive Committee.

In last year's report, I was obliged to report that the number of papers received and the number decided upon were both down from the previous year; this year's numbers show an upturn, still not to the highs from some of my earlier years, but more robust than last year. My guess last year was that it was just the luck of the draw, so to speak, a statistical blip in the yearly figures, and the higher numbers this year suggest that that was the right interpretation. Still, submission rates do bear watching, in case there are trends to note and things that can be done by the editor or others to encourage greater numbers of submissions. For now, we will remain content with the belief that *Language* is still a journal of choice for most linguists looking to publish in a highly visible and competitive journal. The relevant figures for the past year are given in Table 1; they do not include the one review article or the three obituaries accepted in the period, as these were all commissioned works not subject to formal review by anyone other than the editor.

Papers submitted since November 1, 2006	101
Papers acted on since November 1, 2006	100
Accepted	18
Returned for revisions with an invitation to resubmit	9
Rejected outright	73

TABLE 1. Papers submitted and acted on Nov. 1, 2006–Oct. 31, 2007.

(Note that the set of papers submitted and the set of papers acted on overlap, but the papers in each, and thus the numbers, do not (and could not) match—some (indeed most) of those submitted within the past twelve months were acted on within that period, but some were still in the review process at the end of the reporting period; further, some papers acted on had been submitted in the previous year.)

In an average month last year, therefore, *Language* received 8.4 papers, and 8.3 final decisions were made. As noted, these numbers are below the average of the previous years of my editorship, where approximately 10 submissions came in each month and 10 decisions were made; but they are up from last year at this time.

Based on the above figures for final decisions made, the acceptance rate for the year is 18% for all submissions acted on, a figure that is lower than last year's rate of 23% and closer to the average rate for the first five years of my editorship, 19.9%. Including this year, therefore, the average rate of acceptance throughout my term as editor is a quite low 19.6%, reflecting *Language*'s highly selective review process and high standards for publication.

The distribution of submissions and acceptances across the different subfields of our discipline in the past year is quite similar to what has been reported on in past years; there is still a heavy concentration in what may be termed the 'traditional core areas of modern linguistics', but there are also some interesting, even if probably ephemeral, surprises in the mix, such as three papers in 'Language and literature'. The breakdown

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of areas is given in Table 2, with the assessment of the primary area for a paper's content made in the editorial office (not by the authors). As in the past, a disclaimer is essential: these categories represent identifiable groupings that emerged from a consideration of the overall set of submissions and are not meant as in any way defining the field. These assessments are to some extent arbitrary, and it is certainly true that many papers could be easily categorized in more than one area (e.g. a paper on coordination crosslinguistically could be labeled as syntax or as language typology). Thus this tally must be seen as an imperfect measure, but still one that is, I trust, somewhat instructive.

Syntax	26
Semantics	10
Phonology	10
Morphology	9
Language Typology	9
Language Acquisition	6
Historical Linguistics	5
Psycholinguistics	4
Phonetics	3
Language and Literature	3
Discourse Analysis	2
Language Evolution	2
Pragmatics	2
Anthropological Linguistics	1
Cognitive Linguistics	1
Computational Linguistics	1
Corpus Linguistics	1
English as a Second Language	1
Forensic Linguistics	1
Language of Advertising	1
Sign Language	1
Sociolinguistics	1
Sociology of Language (Lang. Endangerment)	1

TABLE 2. Submitted papers by area of specialization.

It is tempting perhaps to try to read into these numbers some deep facts about trends in the field, but it seems to me to ultimately be an exercise in futility. I am pleased that there continue to be submissions in a wide range of areas, and that to me is what is important about these numbers.

Similarly, the topical breakdown of the 100 papers acted on shows a similar range (Table 3), the process of assessment as to topic being the same as that used as with the submitted papers.

The greater number of acceptances in syntax and semantics is just a reflection of the greater number of submissions in these two areas. I have said many times, and I repeat it for anyone who might wonder about bias in the outcomes, that I cannot publish what I do not receive, and the primary criterion will always be the quality of the paper submitted based on rigorous peer review and editorial evaluation.

With regard to book reviews and book notices, Gregory Stump's latest year on the job as review editor was another successful one. The number of publications received by the journal rose to 494 in 2007 (versus 354 items in 2006), suggesting that any 'kinks' in the flow of books to *Language* that may have been occasioned by the transition to a new review editor in 2006 have been worked out. And an impressive number of assignments for reviews was made, 55 so far with more to come by the end of this

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that the ads serve a legitimate legal purpose, which they seem to (though the relevant federal regulations can be rather hard to decipher), and generate some added income for the LSA ($300 per ad, less money spent on the additional pages the ads occasion), they can be judged a success. The number of ads has been relatively small (fifteen in all: six in December 2006, three in March 2007, none in June 2007 (understandable, as that is well outside of the usual hiring season), four in September 2007, and two in December 2007), but it is probably worth continuing this feature as long as it offers a viable legally recognized channel for institutions needing to advertise a position in a print medium.

Kenyon visitors. Although the *Language* office can hardly be thought of as a tourist destination, in 2007, continuing the opening of the office to visitors on two occasions in 2006, we welcomed a group of visitors representing the Undergraduate Linguistics Club of Kenyon College (in Gambier, Ohio, about an hour from Columbus). Five students from Kenyon, along with their advisor, Dr. Maria del Carmen Parafita-Couto, visited 202 Mount Hall and were regaled with war stories of the production of the journal, given a chance to see the William Dwight Whitney desk, told about the LSA, provided with LSA FAQ brochures about joining the Society, and encouraged to become student members. I do not anticipate any visits in the coming year, but I am certainly open to any that might be proposed.

Continued presentations on the history of *Language*. It has been an interest of mine during my editorship to look into aspects of the history of the journal, as some of my Editor's Department columns demonstrate. In addition, my now-colleague and former *Language* editorial assistant Dr. Hope Dawson and I have produced a few papers on matters pertaining to *Language* and LSA history (see our note in the December 2004 issue (*Language* 80.4), for instance). In 2007, we continued that activity, as we chronicled the trend toward multiple authorship in linguistic research in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the North American Association for the History of the Language Sciences (NAAHoLS) held in January 2007 in Anaheim; the paper was entitled 'Linguistics: Humanities or science? Evidence from trends in multiple authorship', and in it we drew on data from papers published in *Language* and from submissions to *Language*. We have a presentation planned for the January 2008 NAAHoLS meeting of a similar nature, charting the provenience of *Language* authors geographically and in particular the increasing internationalization of the pool of authors.[4]

The *Twentieth-century index*. Work continues on the updating and correcting the *Twentieth-century index*; some progress is being made, with a volume-by-volume cross-checking of the items in the *Index* for completeness and accuracy. Although it was hoped that this process would be finished by the end of 2007, more work remains. One goal for the coming year is to have this done by the end of my editorship, so that an accurate electronic version of the index can be available, along with the currently available electronic indices for *Language* volumes in the 21st century (on the *Language* website).

The Linguistics Journal Editors Collective. My activities on behalf of a group of editors of linguistics journals continued, with major involvement as well by Joe Salmons (University of Wisconsin, editor of *Diachronica*) and Keren Rice (University of To-

[4] The January 2008 presentation was entitled 'Authorship provenance in *Language*: An increasingly international scope'.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ronto, editor of *International Journal of American Linguistics*). Along with some twenty or so other editors who routinely come to the LSA meeting, we continue to meet on a regular basis at the annual meeting and communicate via a listserv that I administer here at Ohio State University. One project of ours that bore fruit in the past year was the development of a Unified Linguistics Style Sheet as a set of guidelines that linguistics authors and journals can use. As a first public step, we now have a style sheet for references (a source of great variation across journals) that was posted in 2007 on the LinguistList and on the LSA website. Work on the style sheet will continue, as will our meetings. The success of the meetings (all editors who participate say they have benefited from them) and of the listserv (with well over 100 members) leads me to wonder if this group ought perhaps to have some official recognition as an LSA committee or interest group, if such an entity exists. It might be thought of as analogous in some ways to the LSA Committee on the Status of Women in Linguistics, in that it would provide a forum for those involved in a major part of our professional activity, namely publishing in journals. While restricting it to editors might make it less open than LSA committees typically are, it is more the official recognition of the group that I am thinking of and the benefits that might accrue from that, for instance in providing some clout in dealing with publishers or in making a statement about potential problems with the ranking of journals (both topics that have been discussed by the group).[5]

Some concerns and action items

Staffing in the LSA Secretariat and its impact on *Language* operations. This has been a challenging year for those involved in the LSA Secretariat, to be sure, and I do not pretend to have any insight into what is best for the Secretariat in terms of staffing. However, the staffing situation in the Secretariat has had a direct impact on *Language* operations, and I feel it is essential to bring those to the attention of the Executive Committee.

Throughout the first five years of my editorship, there were three staff members in the Secretariat, and certain *Language*-related functions were handled routinely by someone in that office. In particular, anything related to the business end of the journal fell under the purview of the Secretariat, with editorial matters being the concern of the *Language* office. By 'business-related', I am referring specifically to dealing with advertising from publishers, to acting as liaison with the print facility, and to answering correspondence regarding reprint requests, missing issues, and subscriptions in general.

During the past year, with staffing in the LSA office reduced and the interim and then new Executive Director unfamiliar with some of the support that *Language* required, and with deadlines that could not wait for a training period or for the hiring of additional personnel, we took over here in the *Language* office aspects of dealing with advertising that had previously been done by the LSA staff. We now collect the ads from publishers, hassle with them about submitting material to us by a deadline, deal with problems of file format, deliver the ads to the compositors, and generally serve as liaison in the

[5] The Executive Committee was unable to act on this request as there is no provision in the LSA's constitution for such recognition; but the group was encouraged to continue to meet under the auspices of the annual meeting and was invited to bring to the Executive Committee and the LSA membership at large, in the form of resolutions or endorsements, any issues that the group feels are of relevance to the field where LSA involvement would be helpful. As always, I take this opportunity to invite any linguistics journal editors (broadly construed, that is, from any area within linguistics and with any degree of editorial involvement, review editor, associate editor, and the like) among those reading this report to contact me about joining the group and the listserv we maintain.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

production process. None of this is really editorial in nature—the file format issues have to do not with style requirements of the journal but with the delivery of documents in a particular form (.pdf, .eps, .tiff, etc.). We have done this for each issue of 2007 and it actually absorbs a fair bit of time and energy on the part of my editorial assistants.

Similarly, although many people write to us in the *Language* office with concerns about their subscriptions or with requests to reprint *Language* papers, we have always referred them to the LSA Secretariat, as the *Language* office has no part in that angle of journal operations. However, a backlog of correspondence in the LSA office caused by (so it seems to me) understaffing has meant that we here in the *Language* office get repeated messages from such people when the mail we forward to the LSA cannot be dealt with in a timely fashion.

I would thus urge the Executive Committee to do what it can to facilitate the hiring of additional staff in the LSA office and to help to stabilize the staffing situation so that some of the *Language*-related tasks that used to be routinely handled by the Secretariat can be so handled once again. In saying this, I want to emphasize that I am not in any way faulting the Secretariat staff, for they have done yeoman service under what have struck me as exceedingly difficult circumstances. But since we feel in my office the fall-out from the staffing shortages in the main office, I feel compelled to say something here.

Establishing/normalizing the relation of editor to the Executive Committee. When I started as editor in January of 2002, I was told that I was an ex officio member of the Executive Committee, on the committee by virtue of my status as an elected officer of the society but not a voting member. That suited me just fine, and seemed entirely appropriate. The editor answers to the Executive Committee—that is the body to which my annual and mid-year reports are addressed, for instance, and by which budget requests must be approved—so it would not be appropriate for the editor to be a regular member of the Executive Committee. At the same time, the editor is elected by the rank-and-file of the society in much the same way that the president-elect and Executive Committee members themselves are (though in a typically unopposed and thus not very meaningful election). In my ex officio capacity, I attended some but not all of the Executive Committee's meetings, and some portions of those meetings beyond those that concerned *Language*, though admittedly not all that many.

Then late in 2006, I was informed by the Executive Director of the LSA that my ex officio status, as that too of the Program Committee Chair, had been terminated. No explanation was given, and I could find no mention of this action in the minutes of the Executive Committee's meetings from that period; however, I assumed it had to do with a streamlining and perhaps rationalizing of the Executive Committee's membership.

I feel that this is an unfortunate circumstance, and thus would like the Executive Committee to reinstate the editor's ex officio status. As best I can tell, no mention is made of the editor's status in the Society's constitution (though I am the first to admit I may not have looked in the right place), but it seems strange to me that a person elected by the Society's membership and actually elected to a longer term than any member of the Executive Committee (under one construal—by recent tradition, the editor serves for a seven-year term, but is elected to his/her position annually, also something of an oddity, it seems to me) would not have some sort of official standing vis-à-vis the Executive Committee.

Being a regular member of Executive Committee is not, I would say, called for (though it has been a status that the editor has held in the past) since the Executive

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Committee needs to be able to review *Language* and under current procedures nominates the editor for the annual election (if I understand the process correctly). But the ex officio status that I once held would seem to be the best, as that puts the editor in the loop in some official way (I was added to the Executive Committee e-mail list last summer, after having been on it for some years and then removed, but it was done only as an afterthought when I had raised some questions independently about some aspects of Executive Committee functions).

I thus formally request that the Executive Committee reconsider its earlier decision to remove the editor of *Language* from any role in the Executive Committee and ask that it reinstate ex officio status for the editor. Whether this should extend to the *eLanguage* editor is a further issue for the Executive Committee to consider but is one that I do not have a carefully thought out opinion on (but my inclination would be to say yes to that too). I am not seeking that this be done now, as this is my last year as editor and I am not sure that a change in status would make any difference for me, but I feel this issue should be clarified by the time the new editor takes over in January 2009.[6]

Copyright issues—please act on committee's recommendations. During the winter and spring of 2007, I served on an ad hoc committee that the Executive Committee constituted in its meeting in January of 2007 and charged with making recommendations on copyright issues that pertain to LSA publications, and especially to *Language* and *eLanguage*. Dr. Paul Newman, a noted linguist with impeccable additional credentials as a lawyer specializing in intellectual property issues, headed up that committee.

Among its recommendations were a few that affect *Language* rather directly, and in particular the form of the copyright agreement that we oblige authors to sign.

I would thus like to request formally that the Executive Committee, if it hasn't already, act on the recommendations of that committee, so that if the copyright agreement is to be changed, we can implement the changes right away, beginning with the next accepted paper.[7]

THE COMING YEAR—SOME INFORMATION AND SOME REQUESTS

Associate editors. Although it is customary for the annual report to be accompanied by a list of proposed appointees to serve as associate editors for the journal for the coming year, this year is different, and somewhat unusual. As a result of a massive influx of new associate editors last year (six new ones, partly due to the quirks of the timing of various members rotating off the board but also to two from the previous year asking to end their terms a year early), there is only one current (as of December 2007) associate editor who rotates off at the end of the year (see below under acknowledgments). Over my years as editor, I have worked with different numbers of associate editors in a given year: nine in one year, ten in one year, and eleven in other years,

[6] The Executive Committee did not feel it could act positively on this request, given the constraints of the LSA's constitution. It did develop an addition to the Society's by-laws, one that was adopted at the open business meeting in January, extending an official invitation to the editor to participate in the Executive Committee meetings. While I welcome this step, I am not convinced it is sufficient, but may leave it to my successor to pursue this issue further.

[7] The recommendations were approved by the Executive Committee and a new copyright agreement form has been developed, with considerable help from Paul Newman, and is currently being used with all items newly accepted for publication. The debt that I, and all LSA members, owe to Paul for his expert assistance is enormous, and I am pleased to be able to publicly acknowledge his role in guiding *Language* through some tricky legal terrain.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

including 2007. If I do not replace the one editor who rotates off, I will have ten in 2008, which seems to me to be a workable number (indeed, it has worked in the past). Moreover, the distribution of areas of expertise (syntax, typology, field linguistics) is not seriously affected by the departure of the one associate editor, since others remain who cover those areas; and, even though these represent large areas of submissions to the journal, I am confident that the remaining associate editors will be able to cover them adequately. Thus, I am inclined simply to make no new appointments at this time, and to work with the ten who remain, though I would like to reserve the right to submit a nominee for consideration at the mid-year meeting if I feel that another person is needed. Under this scheme, four will rotate off the board next year, so that my successor will inherit an associate editor board that will be a good blend of experience (six members) and new people of his/her choosing (four members).

Concerning the aftermath of my editorship and the transition into the next. In anticipation of the 'transfer of power' a year from now when a new editor takes charge of *Language*, I plan a few steps to make for a smooth transition to allow my successor to hit the ground running with the journal.

1. When I was the editor-designee back in 2001, I found it to be extremely useful first to visit Mark Aronoff at Stony Brook University, in order to get a sense of how the journal office can be set up and how the editorial side of journal operations worked, and later to visit, with Mark and the Executive Director of the LSA, the place of business of our compositor, Maryland Composition (in the Baltimore area), to see the production side of the journal up close. I plan to invite the editor-designee to come to Columbus to see how our office here works, and will be glad to accompany him/her to Maryland Composition. I trust that the LSA can fund these trips and I thus hereby request approval of such an expenditure.[8]
2. For several years we have been developing in the office here an explicit list outlining our procedures for handling papers and for putting together an issue of the journal, and related matters. It is an ongoing project and thus an evolving document. However, I will make certain that such a list is put into final shape, and vetted by all of my assistants. This is not to suggest that the new editor will have to follow the same procedures (we did not follow Mark Aronoff's to the letter, for instance) but we feel it would be helpful to have such a set of procedures as an example of a workable way of managing the journal.
3. Similarly, the *Language* style sheet, a document that is intended to be used not by prospective authors but by authors once their papers have been accepted for publication, could be rewritten somewhat to be clearer on a few key points. As another project throughout the coming year, we will revisit that style sheet and make any adjustments and clarifications that are called for.
4. Finally, in this same vein, I would like to begin to lay the foundation for archiving the materials from my editorship. While there are guidelines at present about the maintaining of confidentiality for referees' identities and the archiving of all correspondence, I would be interested if the Executive Committee has some guidance to offer or a policy to enact regarding journal e-mail correspondence, our electronic database records (using the possibly now defunct or no-longer-supported program Journal Assistant), and paperwork that is not correspondence (e.g. submitted manuscripts). For that matter too, if anyone thinks that revisiting the policy about confiden-

[8] This request was approved, as it was considered to fall under the regular budgetary needs of the journal.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tiality of referees is called for, I would be interested in such a discussion (it being unclear to me if confidentiality must be maintained forever or should perhaps be subject to the same sort of afterlife protection that copyright law now provides—seventy-five years beyond the individual's lifetime—or a similar less expansive protection (e.g. lifetime plus twenty-eight years)).

Some usable space? For the first time in nearly thirty years, coming up in the March issue, the back cover and inside back cover of *Language* will no longer need to be used for the listing of book notices. This makes me wonder if that space could be put to some constructive use. Prior to the creation of book notices, that back cover was simply left blank, and the inside back cover was used for notices about the Publications of the LSA (at a time when there were *Language monographs* and *Language dissertations* among the publications, besides *Language* itself). Such is not the case now, and while we do put 'Information for Contributors' on the inside back cover, it takes up only half a page at best. I think that advertising on the back cover would be tacky, though perhaps it would be more tasteful on the inside back cover. However, I raise this matter in case the Executive Committee has any good ideas about this space and how to use it wisely, if at all.[9]

A suggestion from the Executive Director. Finally, the Executive Director, Felix Oliver, made a money-saving suggestion that seems to me to be worth considering, though I understand that it might have been considered in the past. He suggested that we consider allowing members to opt out of receiving print copies of *Language* if they want to read it electronically (via Project Muse, e.g. through their LSA membership, or via a compact disk that we could make available). It is not clear to me if this would have an impact on membership (without the print journal would it be easy for someone to let their membership lapse, especially if, as is the case with many members, access to Project Muse is possible through their home institutions?) and it is conceivable that the cost per issue printed would increase if the total number of issues that needed to be printed declined, possibly negating any savings. As this is a business decision, it is not strictly speaking within my purview, but it might be a vehicle for some cost-saving with respect to *Language*.[10]

Summing up, and some necessary acknowledgments

Every year at this time, I reflect on how much work goes into producing four issues each year of high-quality material, including what it takes to get each issue out on time, and every year I am amazed at how much there is to do and at the industriousness of a large number of individuals working in various locations country-wide and even world-wide that contributes to this effort. My gratitude to all those involved in each issue of *Language* is immense, and I publicly thank these people here, as an acknowledgment of their good efforts on behalf of the journal, the LSA, and our field.

First, I must mention my associate editors, as I rely heavily on the fine advice and valuable assistance that they offer me on a routine basis, giving me guidance through their evaluations of papers, their recommendation of reviewers, and their general advice on a variety of matters associated with the journal. They all do a fantastic job and merit my special thanks; I thus mention them here by name: Farrell Ackerman, Mark Baker,

[9] Similarly, if any readers have suggestions, please let me know.

[10] The Secretariat will look into this, but if any readers have opinions as to whether they would be interested in receiving *Language* in this way, please let me or the Secretariat know.

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jennifer Cole, Cleo Condoravdi, Bill Davies, Nick Evans, Ted Gibson, Laura Michaelis, Gary Miller, Joe Pater, and Sali Tagliamonte. Bill is rotating off the board as of January 4, 2008, and I thank him for his service and look forward to working with the others during the coming year.

Although this has been a challenging year for the LSA Secretariat, I have received a steady dose of logistical support from its dedicated staff members during all of 2007. At various times throughout the year, Maggie Reynolds, Katha Kissmann, and Felix Oliver served in the capacity of Executive Director and each provided important guidance and input on a variety of matters; moreover, Rita Lewis dealt patiently with my numerous questions and requests and thus merits my special thanks. I have particularly appreciated their generosity with their time and their unfailingly pleasant demeanor. My copyeditors par excellence, Hope Dawson, Frances Kelly, and Audra Starcheus, also deserve special recognition for the excellent job they do, taking the raw material of authorial intent and whipping it into the excellent final products that we publish in the pages of the journal.

As in the past, but so too this year as well, a special acknowledgment must be made of the excellent work that my office staff here in Ohio performs: editorial assistants Helena Riha and Audra Starcheus continued to provide remarkable work—invisible to most *Language* readers—on behalf of the journal, work that is essential to keeping everything running efficiently and to bringing out issues of the journal on time. They routinely go above and beyond the call of duty, thus offering incomparable service to the journal, to the LSA, and to the field at large. As in past years, I could not have managed this year without them. I also need to recognize the extraordinary service that Dr. Hope Dawson has provided again this year; now a colleague in the Department of Linguistics here at Ohio State, she was especially giving of her time, drawing on her experience as my editorial assistant for several years to answer questions my staff and I had about formatting, style, and matters of journal policy.

And, finally, the outside reviewers of submitted papers deserve public recognition and acclamation for their role in the journal's success. Through their professionalism and their willingness to share their expertise they help to make the journal the rousing success that it is; I can truthfully say that I always learn something from the insights they provide on all papers, but especially those that go well beyond my own 'comfort zone' of knowledge and expertise. I thank them for their important service and thus hereby acknowledge the contribution of the following 137 referees to the journal, the Society, and the profession with their fine reports submitted between November 1, 2006 and October 31, 2007 (* indicates that the individual was responsible for more than one report).

Farrell Ackerman*
Alexandra Aikhenvald
Judith Aissen
Adam Albright
Theodora Alexopoulou
Anthony Aristar
Emmon Bach
Mark Baker
Catherine Ball
Mark Baltin
David Basilico
Laurie Bauer
Misha Becker
Elabbas Benmamoun
Douglas Biber
Balthasar Bickel
Jonathan Bobaljik
Kathryn Bock
Robert Borsley
George Aaron Broadwell
Wayles Browne
Daniel Büring
Gregory N. Carlson
Andrew Carnie*
Ana Castro
Jenny Cheshire
Brady Zack Clark
Charles Clifton, Jr.
Peter Cole
John Coleman
Wes Collins
Bernard Comrie
Cleo Condoravdi
Michael Cysouw
Mary Dalrymple
William Davies
Alice Davison
Willem de Reuse
Ilse Depraetere
Holger Diessel
Gerald Docherty
Matthew S. Dryer

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press

David Eddington
Paul Elbourne
Patience Epps
Patrick Farrell
Ralph Fasold
Caroline Féry
Charles Fillmore
Edward Finegan
Paul Foulkes
Mirjam Fried
Stefan A. Frisch
Bruno Galantucci
Matt Goldrick
Sharon Goldwater
Jeff Good
Russell Gray
Hubert Haider
Michael Hammond
Bruce Hayes
Nikolaus Himmelmann
Eric Holt
Marie Huffman
Haike Jacobs
Joachim Jacobs
Jeffrey Kaplan
Simin Karimi
Graham Katz
Paul Kay
Judy Kegl
Cecilia Kirk
Wolfgang Klein
Jean-Pierre Koenig
Maria Koptjevskaja Tamm
Marie Labelle
William Labov
Utpal Lahiri
Beth Levin
Robert Levine
Rochelle Lieber*
Elena Maslova
Lisa Matthewson
Martha McGinnis*
Andrew McIntyre
Laura Michaelis
D. Gary Miller
Marianne Mithun
Shigeru Miyagawa
Benjamin Munson
Renate Musan
Andrew Nevins
John Newman
Johanna Nichols*
Rachel Nordlinger
John Paolillo
Joe Pater
Andrew Pawley
Doris Payne
Rob Pensalfini
Julian Pine
Mark Pitt
Vladimir Plungian
Paul Portner
Marga Reis
Tomas Riad
Keren Rice
Norvin Richards
Don Ringe
Jerrold Sadock
Leslie Saxon
Peter Sells
Izhak Shafran
Ryan Shosted
Andrea Sims
Jennifer L. Smith
Larry Solan
Andrew Spencer
Richard Sproat
Carol Stoel-Gammon
Peter Svenonius
Sali Tagliamonte
Satoshi Tomioka
Judith Tonhauser
John Trueswell
Barbara Vance
Rachel Walker
Dieter Wanner
Lindsay Whaley
Wendy Wilkins
Ellen Woolford
Charles Yang
James Yoon
Annie Zaenen
Hedde Zeijlstra
Ulrike Zeshan
Kie Zuraw

Respectfully submitted,
Brian D. Joseph
Columbus, Ohio
December 10, 2007

https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0025 Published online by Cambridge University Press